

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
6 AT SEATTLE

7 MATTHEW ALVAREZ, *et al.*,

8 Plaintiffs,

9 v.

10 REALPAGE, INC., *et al.*,

11 Defendants.

12 Cause No. C22-1617RSL

13 ORDER

14 This matter comes before the Court on “Plaintiffs’ Ex Parte Motion to Waive Physical
15 Office Requirement for Local Counsel.” A review of the Court’s CM/ECF system shows that
16 Mr. Tieovsky has so far complied with the requirements of LCR 83.1, appearing as a member of
17 the bar of this Court while recognizing that he cannot act as local counsel for purposes of a *pro*
18 *hac vice* application. *See, e.g., Dorian v. Amazon Web Servs., Inc.*, C22-0269JHC. This district
19 is committed to maintaining a high degree of professionalism and civility among the lawyers
20 practicing here and requires local counsel to remind *pro hac vice* counsel of that fact. LCR
21 83.1(d)(2). It also expects local counsel to be familiar with the local rules of this district.
22 Counsel who do not regularly practice in the Western District of Washington may not fully
23 comprehend the magnitude of their responsibilities and may not be well-placed to serve the
24 functions assigned to local counsel. Plaintiffs’ cost-savings argument misses the point of the
25

1 requirement and would effectively abrogate the local rule if adopted. The Court declines to do
2 so.
3
4

5 For all of the foregoing reasons, the motion to waive the physical office requirement
6 (Dkt. # 4) is DENIED.

7
8 Dated this 22nd day of December, 2022.

10 
11 Robert S. Lasnik
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28